

**James Fitzgerald Reserve Pilot CCA Project Pilot  
Steering Committee Meeting  
April 24, 2007 Summary**

**Participants:**

In person: Kellyx Nelson-Resource Conservation District (RCD); Rich Allen-Moss Beach Ranch and RCD; Jack Gregg, Lisa Sniderman-Coastal Commission (CCC); Sam Herzberg-San Mateo County Parks; Carolann Towe-Surfrider; Rainer Hoenicke (San Francisco Estuary Institute); Kathryn Slater-Carter-Montara Water and Sanitary District

Phone-In: Carmen Fewless-Regional Water Quality Control Board; Ann Stillman-County of San Mateo DPW; Kathleen Van Velsor-Association of Bay Area Governments

**Agenda items, key discussion points, agreements:**

1. Mid Course Evaluation-CCA Pilot Project

Participants discussed what has been working well and not working well or could use improvements with regard to the CCA pilot project since January 2006, when the Steering Committee (SC) began meeting. The SC recognized that good progress had been made on planning, assessment, and raising funds (evident from: grant projects that have been awarded that relate to or have leveraged the CCAs; the collection and assimilation of data and maps presented, and successful turnout and great feedback on the February workshop). However, some members also expressed frustration about the painful early stages of the project that involves much “paper-pushing” and “moving the same items around the agenda.” At this time, it is difficult to envision what we will have to show for after three years of meetings. The critical piece that could be improved is communication. We have a lot of maps that summarize information, but what do they mean? If SC members don’t see some “action” that moves us into the problem-solving phase, it will be hard to maintain momentum and commitment. More communication channels need to be opened to let everyone know where we are trying to go and how we might get there. Particularly, communication between technical partners and the Steering Committee as well as the public, could be improved. For example, a lot has been going on that the SC and public do not necessarily see that might be improved through more structure. (See Agenda Item 4. below). Additionally, the SC voiced that having more local leadership could also be helpful.

2. Review Action Items from December 12 Meeting

The SC renewed interest in a targeted (Nonpoint Source Pollution) education/outreach effort on the MidCoast. The Action Item from December was for Kathryn (Montara San District) to contact various potential partnering agency staff (e.g., County Health, Stormwater, Ag Commissioner, etc.), to set up a meeting to discuss the idea. Kathryn indicated she still is working on this item. Kellyx and Carolann reported that at a meeting they had with Dean Peterson, they had mentioned to him to try and get the County Department of Environmental Health back to the table after Steve Hartsell’s retirement

left a major gap. Also, Rich mentioned that he'd like to see us take a look at drought in the study area watersheds.

**Action Items:**

- **Kathryn and Ann (County of San Mateo) will work together to reach out to appropriate potential partners to set up a meeting to discuss relative interest in such an effort.**
  - **Ann and Sam will approach the County on the issue and report to Kathryn and the SC.**
3. Update from technical partners (Rainer, SFEI; Kathleen, ABAG)-recap on tech work completed to date and moving forward

Rainer passed out a handout entitled, Draft Outline CCA Phase I Final Report, which identified the major sections of the Final Report (due October 31 2007; draft due August 1, 2007). Rainer expressed that the SC would be receiving a draft Watershed Assessment report probably in early May. Lisa (CCC) asked Rainer to identify which elements of the Draft Outline might be included in the Assessment Report and he noted primarily: info from 2. Existing Information Summary, Task 2 (Identify Land Use Types and Sources of Pollutants), Task 3, (Estimate Load Reductions), and incorporation of the deliverables and results of the Workshop. Rainer also passed out and walked the SC through other handouts on Major Deliverables of SFEI's 319(h) grant, and on Project Objectives, Tasks and Budget for the next phase of the technical work. Workshop outcomes and priorities were not discussed, and the SC felt that it would be good to revisit these at a future meeting to delve into priorities. Kathleen recapped some of the work performed to date (watershed boundary discussion and delineation, development of priority areas for investigation, initial review of imperviousness, production of GIS maps relating to the priority areas, workshops) and outlined some additional areas where investigation is either underway or completed (e.g. Pillar Point Air Force facility and finer grained look at imperviousness). Sam mentioned the Reserve's coordination with the STOPP program on the development of the parking lot for the FMR interpretive center, and Kellyx mentioned the investigation planned into nitrate contamination of groundwater. It was also noted that there are no water quality monitoring data for many of the watersheds under assessment, and the Assessment would describe data gaps like these. Kathleen also noted that for Phase I evaluation purposes, the Deer Creek watershed was still incorporated as a draft study section. The members asked for a current study area map like that presented at the Workshop. The SC felt that the description of the various work phases (1. watershed characterization and assessment; 2. Action Plan development and building the "tool box" for those implementing actions, as well as development and identification of early action opportunities; and 3. long-term implementation of Action Plan items) should be summarized for the general public and stakeholders in some kind of fact sheet that is less encumbered with jargon than the current work descriptions.

4. Proposed draft timeline/flow chart (Lisa (CCC), Kellyx (RCD))

To help everyone see the flow and connections between different project tasks, products

and groups involved in the CCA pilot project, Lisa and Kellyx developed a timeline. Kellyx presented the proposed timeline and described key components, such as Assessment work and Action Plan Development work, all relevant dates and deliverables, and the flow paths between groups and dates (such as releasing a draft report and having a public workshop to vet the report). This visual should also help to improve communication both with technical partners and with the public.

**Action Items:**

**Kellyx will e-mail draft timeline to the SC, and everyone will review it and provide Kellyx with key information to add or revise. We will have the timeline available at each meeting to update as necessary.**

**Technical partners and SC will work with Kellyx to evaluate if the annotated timeline can serve as the “non-jargony” fact sheet to concisely communicate how the Prop 50 CCA grant and other, related projects fit together (e.g., the new Visitor Center and demonstration parking lot, the Clean Beaches grant, the ASBS monitoring guidance development, etc.)**

5. Update on Marine Protected areas Process (Kellyx)

Kellyx provided a quick update on the MPA process and noted that is not related to nonpoint source pollution and revolves primarily around extractive use of marine resources. Kellyx will continue to keep the group apprised of any related efforts.

6. Operating Principles, MOU, Roles and Responsibilities ((Kellyx)

Kellyx asked the SC for any revisions to the draft Operating Principles that she had proposed (3/22/07). The SC discussed a few possible revisions but is in support of both concept and text. Kellyx also raised the idea of having an MOU between the SC members. Everyone was in support of the idea, and Kellyx will follow up at the next meeting. The SC would consider an MOU process probably during the summer. Kellyx did not have the opportunity to discuss roles and responsibilities, but in general, described her idea for having an MOU with roles and responsibilities, including a decision-making process, outlined, and including the Operating Principles as an Appendix. Before taking on these responsibilities (developing MOU, web page, accepting grant funds, etc.), Kellyx asked for confirmation from the group that the Steering Committee would like the RCD to serve as a local host for the project. There was some discussion about the San Mateo RCD’s traditional role in rural areas and other RCDs’ roles in more urban areas. The Steering Committee gave its approval for the RCD to serve as the local host for the project. The idea of a simplified slide presentation that SC members could use as a briefing tool to their constituents and/or decision-makers was well received.

**Action Item:**

**Lisa will discuss some of the proposed revisions with Al Wanger at CCC and e-mail Kellyx; Kellyx will send out revised Operating Principles to the SC and work with Lisa to add to CCA website; Kellyx also agreed to circulate some samples of applicable MOU language from other, similar projects.**

7. Permit coordination and relationship to CCA pilot (Sam-County Parks)

This item will be carried over to the next meeting.

8. Steering Committee composition (Lisa-CCC)

The SC only briefly touched on this item. It was clear that we may want to consider additional people for the SC, particularly Greg Smith from County Environmental Health and possibly Matt Price, Rich Gordon's Aide. Further, Lisa was not able to get a hold of Geoff Davis and Chuck Kozak and assumes that they are no longer able to serve on the SC. This item will be carried over to the next meeting.

9. Next steps/Emerging Issues/Action Items

Rich Allen wanted to discuss the relationship of drought and the CCA. This will be carried over to the next meeting.

To keep momentum and finish some of the Agenda Items, the next Steering Committee meeting will be on **Thursday, May 24, 10 am-12 pm** at Montara Water and Sanitary District. At this meeting, we will:

1. Have updates or announcements (e.g., grants executed, upcoming projects, noteworthy meetings)
2. Review Action Items from this summary (Lisa-CCC)
3. Discuss status of draft Watershed Assessment Report and whether we want to set up a special SC meeting focused on it. (Lisa-CCC)
4. Review workshop outcomes and determine how SC can help refine priorities (??)
5. MOU-Follow up and propose straw man (Kellyx-RCD)
6. Permit coordination and relationship to CCA pilot (Sam-County Parks)
7. Steering Committee composition (Lisa-CCC)
8. Revisit regular SC meeting date (was originally every 2 months, second Thursday of the month) (Lisa-CCC)
9. Drought and relation to CCA project (Rich)